

## Remarks

Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11, and 16 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner objected to the specification as not describing a computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully point out that the specification describes a computer readable medium at page 4, lines 18-22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants submit that the specification describes a computer readable medium with a program recorded thereon. A transmission signal is not a medium and a program would not actually be recorded on the signal. A transmission signal might transmit program instructions, but the instructions would not be recorded on the signal. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the pages 6-7 of the specification (referred to as AAPA) in view of the Varadarajan et al. article. The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Varadarajan et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,640,140 to Lindner et al.

The combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the claimed invention since, among other things, the combination does not suggest querying a reference to an interface of the Aspect Object with a web client application in a client device external to the Control System through the internet or an intranet, wherein the Aspect Object includes a Composite Object comprising Aspects of the Aspect Object. Additionally, the combination does not suggest carrying out with the web client application a table look-up of a reference to the Aspects of the Aspect Object. Furthermore, the combination does not suggest accessing with the client a function of the real world object.

As discussed in the specification, the claimed invention provides significant advantages over the art discussed there since the claimed invention carries out querying and look-up functions on a client rather than utilizing resources of the control system of the real world object. As such, the claimed invention more efficiently utilizes resources of the control system and provides for increased reliability in the control of real world objects. Varadarajan et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of AAPA. Varadarajan et al. only suggests a scheme for buying and selling software, whereas the claimed invention permits a client to access a function of a real world object to control the real world object.

AAPA requires software, such as dynamic link libraries to be preinstalled in the client devices. AAPA also does not suggest how to resolve access to an aspect of an aspect object utilizing internet technology. These represent significant differences with the claimed invention, which utilizes a web client application, such as a web browser.

Accordingly, the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16. Therefore, the invention recited in claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA and Varadarajan et al. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 13 since, among other things, Lindner et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of AAPA or Varadarajan et al. Along these lines, Lindner et al. does not suggest querying a reference to an interface of the Aspect Object with a web client application in a client device external to the Control System through the internet or an intranet, carrying out with the web client application a table look-up of a reference to the Aspects of the Aspect Object, or accessing with the client a function of the real world object.

In view of the above, the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 13. It follows that the invention recited in claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of AAPA, Varadarajan et al. and Lindner et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request withdrawal of the

rejections based on the cited references.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicant  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300